## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA Richmond Division

) )
)
) Case No. 3:18-cv-00828-MHL
)
)

## MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR LEAVE TO EXCEED LOCAL RULE PAGE LIMIT

Plaintiff Sheri Wade ("Ms. Wade"), by counsel and pursuant to Local Rule 7(F)(3) ("LR 7[F][3]"), hereby submits her Memorandum in Support of Motion for Leave to Exceed Local Rule Page Limit (the "Motion"). In support of the relief requested in the Motion, Ms. Wade respectfully states the following:

## **ARGUMENT**

- 1. On March 19, 2019, Ms. Wade moved for default judgment against Defendant Interworks Unlimited, Inc. (ECF No. 9).
- 2. On August 12, 2019, the Court entered an Order (ECF No. 11) denying Ms. Wade's Motion for Default Judgment without prejudice and granting Ms. Wade leave to file a Second Motion for Default Judgment provided that Ms. Wade addressed certain decisional law penned by the Supreme Court of the United States regarding the stream of commerce theory of personal jurisdiction.

- 3. Ms. Wade is confident that she can address these authorities (and their progeny) and demonstrate that they do not counsel a different result than the one urged in Ms. Wade's original Memorandum in Support of Motion for Default Judgment.
- 4. However, Ms. Wade does believe that it would be difficult to give all of the issues implicated by the Second Motion for Default Judgment a complete analysis within the 30 pages permitted by LR 7(F)(3).
- 5. Accordingly, Ms. Wade respectfully requests leave to exceed the page limit of 30 pages set forth in LR 7(F)(3) by 10 pages in submitting her Memorandum in Support of Second Motion for Default Judgment.
- 6. In the alternative, Ms. Wade requests leave to incorporate content by reference from her original Memorandum in Support of Motion for Default Judgment (ECF No. 10) into her Memorandum in Support of Second Motion for Default Judgment where appropriate to conserve as much briefing space as possible for addressing the most complex issue presented by Ms. Wade's request for default judgment in this case—i.e., personal jurisdiction.
- 7. Good cause exists to grant the relief requested herein. Ms. Wade's original filing facially demonstrates that she made every effort to address all of the issues necessary to establish the propriety of default judgment in this case within LR 7(F)(3)'s page limit of 30 pages, but that the analysis was nonetheless unduly cramped.
- 8. Good cause further exists to grant the relief requested herein in that the personal jurisdiction question raised in this case is a novel one in the Fourth Circuit and, accordingly, merits a greater depth of analysis than more settled issues of law.

## **CONCLUSION**

Accordingly, Ms. Wade respectfully requests that the Court grant her the relief requested by the Motion and any other relief deemed appropriate.

DATE: August 14, 2019	Respectfully submitted, SHERI WADE
	By:/s/ Counsel

Jonathan E. Halperin, Esq. (VSB No. 32698) Andrew Lucchetti, Esq. (VSB No. 86631) Isaac A. McBeth, Esq. (VSB No. 82400) Halperin Law Center, LLC 5225 Hickory Park Drive, Suite B Glen Allen, VA 23059 Phone: (804) 527-0100 Facsimile: (804) 597-0209

Facsimile: (804) 597-0209 jonathan@hlc.law andrew@hlc.law isaac@hlc.law

and

Brody Reid, Esq. (VSB No.75343) Reid Goodwin, PLC 4116 Fitzhugh Avenue Richmond, Virginia 23230 Phone: (804) 415-7800 Facsimile: (804) 415-7560

breid@reidgoodwin.com Counsel for Plaintiff